

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated September 10, 2010. With this response, claim 1 is amended and all pending claims 1, 4-24, 26-29, and 32-34 are presented for reconsideration and favorable action.

The specification has also been amended to correct a typographical error.

In the Office Action, the rejections based upon Eryurek US6017143 in view of Flaemig US7054765 and further in view of Meyer-Grafe US6957115 was continued. However, the Office Action elaborated on the Eryurek reference with respect to the rejection.

In the Office Action, a section of Eryurek (column 3, lines 9-12) was cited as showing a sensor. The sensor described in this section is a process variable sensor which is used to sense a process variable, such as flow or pressure of a process fluid flowing through, for example, a pipe. In the Eryurek reference the signal from the process variable sensor can be used to perform diagnostics. Next, the instant application was cited which describes a process interface 120. The process interface is shown as generic item which illustrates how the device 100 interfaces with the industrial process. This interface can be a process variable sensor used to sense a variable of the process such as flow or temperature or can be a control element such as a valve controller. The process interface 120 is not the device interface illustrated at element 310 in Figure 5. A typographical error at page 18, line 7 of the instant specification is amended to correct this confusion.

In contrast, the device interface 310 is a part of the supervisory overlayer 104 and used to provide an interface for the supervisory overlayer with the device circuitry and is described generally at page 21, line 5- page 24, lines 7.

Therefore, as discussed in the prior response, the Eryurek reference does not show the device interface as set forth in the pending claims. Further, Applicant notes that independent claim 1 further clarifies this matter as a separate process interface (i.e., “a process variable sensor configured to sense the process variable”) is called out in the claim. Thus, the claimed device interface is clearly not the same as the claimed process variable sensor in claim 1.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the rejection claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. Consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Judson K. Champlin/
Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312